OSBORN MALEDON		
The Phoenix Plaza 21st Floor 2299 North Central Avenue Phoenix, Arizona 85012-2793 P.O. Box 36379 Phoenix, Arizona 85067-6399 Telephone 602.640.9000	Joseph A. Kanefield (015838) Brunn W. Roysden III (028698) BALLARD SPAHR LLP 1 East Washington Street, Suite 2300 Phoenix, Arizona 85004-2555 Telephone: 602.798.5400 kanefieldj@ballardspahr.com Colin F. Campbell (004955) Mary R. O'Grady (011434)	
Facsimile 602.640.9050 6 7 8 9 10	Jeffrey B. Molinar (018512) Joseph N. Roth (025725)  OSBORN MALEDON, P.A. (00196000) 2929 North Central Avenue, Suite 2100 Phoenix, Arizona 85012-2793 Telephone: 602.640.9000 ccampbell@omlaw.com mogrady@omlaw.com jmolinar@omlaw.com	
11	jroth@omlaw.com	
12	Attorneys for the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission	
13	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
14	FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA	
15	Wesley W. Harris, et al.,	No.: 2:12-CV-00894-ROS-NVW-RRC
16	Plaintiffs,	DEFENDANT ARIZONA INDEPENDENT
17	vs.	REDISTRICTING COMMISSION'S STATEMENT OF DISCOVERY DISPUTE
18	Arizona Independent Redistricting	(ACCIONED TO TUDEE HIDGE DANIEL)
19	Commission,	(ASSIGNED TO THREE-JUDGE PANEL)
20	Defendant.	
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

Plaintiffs should not be permitted to depose D. J. Quinlan at this late date. First, Mr. Quinlan's involvement with redistricting for the Democratic Party has been a matter of public record since the early phases of the process. (See 9/26/11Tr;AIRCH0014252.) Although Commissioner McNulty's testimony is new information, Mr. Quinlan's role with the Democratic Party was well known to Plaintiffs and their attorneys, all of whom attended Commission meetings and followed the process closely. If they wanted to depose him, they should have made this desire known a long time ago.

Second, what matters here is the intent of the Commission, not third parties. Plaintiffs' counsel has now had the opportunity to depose all five commissioners, and deposing Mr. Quinlan adds nothing regarding the Commission's intent. Even if the thumb drive with possible changes to Districts 8 and 11 were prepared with Mr. Quinlan's assistance, nothing became part of the map until it was considered by the Commission itself. If Plaintiffs want to argue partisan motivation, they can make that argument based on the record and the Commissioners' testimony, as Plaintiffs have done in their Statement about this discovery dispute. They do not need to depose Mr. Quinlan to make that argument.

Moreover, although Plaintiffs questioned the Democratic Commissioners and the chair in detail about their third-party contacts, they asked the Republican Commissioners none of those questions. Permitting a deposition of one party official's involvement does not make sense without digging into the other party's involvement as well. Therefore, if discovery is going to be expanded to include Mr. Quinlan, the Commission will also seek to depose John Mills, the former House of Representatives Republican staff person who followed redistricting for his party. Tom Hofeller, for example, the Plaintiffs' expert just turned over an e mail with John Mills. The better course, however, is to limit the discovery to the depositions previously noticed. And, for the record, although registration in the final map of LD 8 favored Democrats, registration alone does not predict success. Actual election results suggested that it was a competitive district that leans Republican. No further discovery is needed to tell this district's story.

Caşe 2:12-cv-00894-ROS-NVW-RRC Document 165 Filed 03/12/13 Page 3 of 3